

MEMORANDUM

5 June 2018

From: (b)(6), Code 41250 (Chair)
(b)(6), Code 41250
(b)(6), Code 41250
(b)(6), Code 41250
(b)(6), Code 43130

To: Lynda Hall, Code 22410 (Contracting Officer)
Via: Johannes Cardenas, Code 22410 (Contract Specialist)

Subj: SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD (SSEB) REPORT WITH COMBINED RATING
SHEETS N66001-15-R-0118 Tactical Networks (TACNET) In-Service Engineering Activity (ISEA)

Encl: Attachment 2 - Acceptability of the Offer Rating Sheet (for all offerors)
Attachment 3 - Organizational Experience Evaluation Rating Sheet (for all offerors)
Attachment 4 - Past Performance Rating Sheet (excluding offeror(s) with Marginal or below in
Organizational Experience)
Attachment 5 - Small Business Participation Rating Sheet (excluding offeror(s) with Marginal or below in
Organizational Experience)

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the final rating sheets for all three offerors which submitted proposals in response to solicitation N66001-16-R-0118.
2. The rating sheets reflect the SSEB's consensus.
3. The evaluation was conducted fairly and in accordance with the Source Selection Plan for the subject

(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____
(b)(6) Code 41250 (Chair)	_____		
(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____
(b)(6) Code 41250	_____		
(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____
(b)(6) Code 41250	_____		
(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____
(b)(6) Code 41250	_____		
(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____
(b)(6) Code 43130	_____		
(b)(6)	_____	Date	_____

Johannes Cardenas, Code 22410

(b)(6)

ATTACHMENT 2 – ACCEPTABILITY OF THE OFFER RATING SHEET

Offeror: KES

Reviewer: Johannes Cardenas

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer “Yes” to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable. Those offers determined to be acceptable will be forwarded to the next level of evaluation; those offers determined to be unacceptable may be classified as “deficient” and may be eliminated from further consideration and not evaluated further, or may be forwarded to the next level for evaluation if considered beneficial to the Government by the Procuring Contracting Officer. However, in order to be considered for award, a previously unacceptable offer must become acceptable through discussions.

Acceptability of the Offer:

(b)(5)

Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions.

Offeror has acknowledged all material amendments.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions.

Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions (e.g., for small business set-asides with provision 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, ensure that at least 50 percent of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel shall be expended for employees of the concern).

Offer does not impose any additional material conditions to RFP.

If answers to any of the above requirements are “No”, identify and document:

(b)(5)

Rating: Acceptable / Unacceptable (Select one):

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 3 – ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE EVALUATION RATING SHEET

Offeror: KES

Reviewer: Consensus

(b)(5)

Pages 4 through 19 redacted for the following reasons:

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 2 – ACCEPTABILITY OF THE OFFER RATING SHEET

Offeror: MCKEAN

Reviewer: Johannes Cardenas

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer “Yes” to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable. Those offers determined to be acceptable will be forwarded to the next level of evaluation; those offers determined to be unacceptable may be classified as “deficient” and may be eliminated from further consideration and not evaluated further, or may be forwarded to the next level for evaluation if considered beneficial to the Government by the Procuring Contracting Officer. However, in order to be considered for award, a previously unacceptable offer must become acceptable through discussions.

Acceptability of the Offer:

(b)(5)

Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions.

Offeror has acknowledged all material amendments.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions.

Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions (e.g., for small business set-asides with provision 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, ensure that at least 50 percent of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel shall be expended for employees of the concern).

Offer does not impose any additional material conditions to RFP.

If answers to any of the above requirements are “No”, identify and document:

(b)(5)

Rating: Acceptable / Unacceptable (Select one):

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 3 – ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE EVALUATION RATING SHEET

Offeror: MCKEAN

Reviewer: Consensus

(b)(5)

Pages 22 through 55 redacted for the following reasons:

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 2 – ACCEPTABILITY OF THE OFFER RATING SHEET

Offeror: SAIC

Reviewer: Johannes Cardenas

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer “Yes” to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable. Those offers determined to be acceptable will be forwarded to the next level of evaluation; those offers determined to be unacceptable may be classified as “deficient” and may be eliminated from further consideration and not evaluated further, or may be forwarded to the next level for evaluation if considered beneficial to the Government by the Procuring Contracting Officer. However, in order to be considered for award, a previously unacceptable offer must become acceptable through discussions.

Acceptability of the Offer:

(b)(5)

Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions.

Offeror has acknowledged all material amendments.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions.

Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions.

Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions (e.g., for small business set-asides with provision 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, ensure that at least 50 percent of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel shall be expended for employees of the concern).

Offer does not impose any additional material conditions to RFP.

If answers to any of the above requirements are “No”, identify and document:

(b)(5)

Rating: Acceptable / Unacceptable (Select one):

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 3 – ORGANIZATIONAL EXPERIENCE EVALUATION RATING SHEET

Offeror: SAIC

Reviewer: Consensus

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Pages 58 through 66 redacted for the following reasons:

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 4 – PAST PERFORMANCE RATING SHEET

Offeror: SAIC

Reviewer: Consensus

Step 1:

Evaluate each past performance reference to determine how recent the effort. To be deemed recent the work must have been performed since 01 January 2012.

(b)(5)

Page 68 redacted for the following reason:

(b)(5)

ATTACHMENT 5 – SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION RATING SHEET

Offeror: SAIC

Reviewer: Johannes Cardenas

Offerors have submitted a matrix identifying all small business concerns proposed for contract performance, whether as prime contractors or subcontractors. Offerors have also identified in the matrix the extent to which each identified business will be participating, as a percentage of the total value of the acquisition (including options).

The Government will evaluate the total percentage of small business participation. The inclusion of each subcontractor in the cost proposal shall serve as evidence that the prime contractor and subcontractor have entered into a business agreement; no further evidence of a business agreement is required. Only the portion of small business participation that is both listed in the matrix and substantiated by the cost proposal will be considered in the evaluation.

Note: If there is a discrepancy between what is reflected in the Small Business Participation Information Sheet and the prime/subcontractor's cost proposal, the amount reflected in the cost proposal will be used for the evaluation of small business participation.

The evaluation of this factor will result in a rating of Unacceptable, Marginal, Acceptable, Good, or Outstanding. The Government will compare the total percent of small business participation to the following table:

Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Good	Outstanding
5.0% or less	≥5.1% - 9.9%	≥10% - 15.9%	≥16% - 19.9%	≥20%

A rating of unacceptable will be considered a deficiency and would only be correctable through discussions.

Note: If there is a discrepancy between what is reflected in the Small Business Participation Information Sheet and the prime/subcontractor's cost proposal, the amount reflected in the cost proposal will be used for the evaluation of small business participation.

Rating Procedure: Reviewers will examine the offeror's Small Business Participation Information Sheet submitted with its offer, and use the table above to select the rating based on the total percent of small business participation in the offeror's proposal.

Summ

Ratin

(b)(5)